

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 27 and 30-50 are pending and rejected in the present application. Claim 46 is canceled hereby, claims 2-3, 27, 30-32, 34 and 47-50 are amended hereby; and claim 51 is added hereby.

Responsive to the objection to the specification, claims 27, 31 and 32 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification is now in allowable form.

Responsive to the objection to claims 2-3, 27 and 32, claims 2-3, 27 and 32 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-3, 27 and 32 are now in allowable form.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 27, 30 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,912,529 (Kolfman) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,725,4249 (Schwerdtfeger), Applicants transverse the rejection of claim 1, have amended claims 2, 27, 30 and 34, and submit that claim 1, 4 and 5 are in condition for allowance in their present form, and claims 2, 27, 30 and 34 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 recites in part “outputting the converted content into a plurality of output devices; and coordinating the plurality of output devices so that the plurality of the output devices delivers synchronized output.” (Emphasis added). Applicants submit that the subject matter of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, and includes distinct advantages thereover.

The Examiner cites Schwerdtfeger as disclosing screen readers that synchronize video and sound. However, claim 1 refers to output being synchronized between multiple output devices rather than within a single output device. That is, Schwerdtfeger does not disclose coordinating output devices such that their outputs are synchronized with each other. Such is clearly the meaning of “synchronized” as the term is used at page 10, line 30 through page 11,

line 12 of the present publication WO2005/050395. Thus, the cited references do not disclose or suggest outputting the converted content into a plurality of output devices, and coordinating the plurality of output devices so that the plurality of the output devices delivers synchronized output, as recited by claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2, 4-5 depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance in their present form.

Claim 27, as amended, recites in part “providing a computerized output configuration toolbar to the special needs person; and modifying output to the special needs person based upon a selected configuration, wherein the toolbar is configured to modify an existing third-party software application.” (Emphasis added). Applicants submit that the subject matter of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, and includes distinct advantages thereover.

The Examiner cites buttons of Schwerdtfeger as disclosing a toolbar. However, a pressable button of Schwerdtfeger is not a toolbar. A toolbar may be defined as “a row of icons on a computer screen that activate commands or functions when clicked.” The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. The pressable button of Schwerdtfeger is not on a computer screen and cannot be clicked.

Moreover, the button of Schwerdtfeger does not modify a software application. Rather, the button merely causes a “next line” portion of document 12 to be presented. Thus, the cited references do not disclose or suggest “providing a computerized output configuration toolbar to a special needs person, and modifying output to the special needs person based upon a selected configuration, wherein the toolbar is configured to modify an existing third-party software application”, as recited by amended claim 27.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 27 and claims 30 and 34 depending therefrom, are now in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

In addition to being patentable by virtue of depending from claim 27, Applicants submit that amended claim 30 is separately patentable. Claim 30, as amended, recites in part that “the special needs person can modify voice selection”. Applicants submit that the cited references are completely silent as to modifying voice selection, as recited by amended claim 30.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of US Publication No. 2005/0021859 (Willian), Applicants point out that claim 3 depends from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 3 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of US Patent No. 6,925,595 (Whitledge), Applicants point out that claim 6 depends from claim 5, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 6 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of US Patent No. 7,065,483 (Decary), Applicants point out that claims 7-9 depend from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claims 7-9 are also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman, Schwerdtfeger and Decary in view of US Publication No. 2002/0178007 (Slotznick), Applicants point out that claim 43 depends from claim 7, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 43 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman, Schwerdtfeger and Decary in view of US Patent No. 4,470,821 (LeCapelain), Applicants point out that claims 44-45 depends from claim 7, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claims 44-45 are also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of US Patent No. 7,333,507 (Bravin), Applicants point out that claim 33 depends from claim 27, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 33 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of Willian, Applicants point out that claim 35 depends from claim 27, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 35 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 41 recites in part that “the providing of channels step includes permitting access to at least one of an access group comprising a Braille keyboard and a sip-and-puff device.” (Emphasis Added). The Examiner cites Schwerdtfeger as disclosing a Braille display. However, a display is not a keyboard by which an individual can provide responses. Rather, an individual

can only receive information via a display. Accordingly, claim 41 is in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Applicants point out that claim 42 depends from claim 35, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 42 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 36-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger and Willian in view of US Patent Publication No. 2003/0152904 (Doty), Applicants point out that claims 36-40 depend from claim 35, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claims 36-40 are also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

In addition to depending from allowable claim 35, Applicants submit that claim 37 is separately patentable. Claim 37 recites in part “using the processor to prevent the person from returning to a portion of the test”. Applicants submit that the cited references are completely silent as to this subject matter of claim 37. Accordingly, claim 37 is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwerdtfeger in view of Bravin, Applicants have amended claim 31 and submit that claim 31 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 31, as amended, recites in part that “the output is synchronized for multiple simultaneous outputs.” (Emphasis added). Thus, claim 31 recites subject matter that is substantially similar to the subject matter of claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 31 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfinan in view of Schwerdtfeger, Applicants have amended claim 32 and submit that claim 32 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 32, as amended, recites in part “providing a plurality of communication channels on the portable system by which the special needs person may interact with the portable system, the channels including at least one of a Braille keyboard and a sip-and-puff device; and recording responses from said special needs person communicated via at least one of said channels.” (Emphasis added). Thus, amended claim 32 recites subject matter substantially similar to the subject matter of claim 41, which is in condition for allowance for the reason given above. Accordingly, amended claim 32 is also in condition for allowance which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfinan and Schwerdtfeger in view of Willian, Applicants have cancelled claim 46.

Claim 50, as amended, recites “permitting access to a sip-and-puff device.” (Emphasis added). Thus, amended claim 50 recites subject matter substantially similar to the subject matter of claim 41, which is in condition for allowance for the reason given above. Accordingly, amended claim 50 is also in condition for allowance which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 47-49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfinan, Schwerdtfeger and Willian in view of Doty, Applicants point out that claims 47-49 depend from claim 32, which is in condition for allowance for all of the reasons given above. Accordingly, claims 47-49 are also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 51 has been added to further protect the patentable subject matter of the present invention. Claim 51 recites that “the plurality of the output devices delivers output synchronized for multiple simultaneous outputs.” (Emphasis added). Such subject matter is disclosed at page 11, line 1 of the present specification (WO2005/050395).

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe, in view of the amendments and remarks herein, that all grounds of rejection of the claims have been addressed and overcome, and that all still pending claims are in condition for allowance.

In the event any issue(s) remain that could be resolved by telephone, the undersigned invites the Examiner to contact him to expedite the examination of this application. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

/Keith J. Swedo/

November 18, 2009

Keith J. Swedo, Reg. No. 43,176
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
One Indiana Square
Suite 3500
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2023
Phone: (317) 713-3500
Fax: (317) 713-3699